

At the Daily Era can be had every morning at the Periodical Stand of Mr. J. T. BATES, Exchange, Philadelphia; also, the Weekly Era.

Mr. JAMES ELLIOTT is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1854.

### "THE ORIGINAL" POLICY.

"Was not the policy of the fathers of the Republic," asks the *Sentinel*, "made to declare in the most emphatic manner possible, that Slavery should be secured outside the State limits; and that whosoever Slavery should be, the ubiquitous arm of the 'exclusive jurisdiction' of the General Government alone secures this Slavery, and holds it Slavery, not only where it has exclusive jurisdiction, but in the very heart of free soil and Free-Soil, where in fact the only jurisdiction, almost, which the General Government possesses, is the jurisdiction to hold a slave still a slave, and all the retained sovereignty of a State, pooled exclusively with Free-Soilers, has to acknowledge the rightful jurisdiction of the General Government to take and restore the fugitive? In truth, it may be clearly stated that the whole power of the 'exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government' is not only authorized, but pledged to exert it, not only where its power is exclusive, but where it is restricted and limited by all the retained sovereignty of States; that, in fact, to whoever Slavery attaches, no power on earth, in its own State, in other States, in the National domain, or upon the seas, shall loosen that bond, except by the action of the bondholder himself."

This is the last consideration urged by the *Sentinel* against the position, that the original policy of the Government was to restrict Slavery within State limits, and secure freedom within the exclusive jurisdiction of the General Government. Here, as throughout the argument, the *Sentinel* relies upon mere exceptions, to overturn a general truth. We have never claimed that the Anti-Slavery views of the fathers of the Republic were fully embodied in the Government they founded; that they were not at times constrained, by circumstances appearing to them imperative to qualify them to a certain extent; that the Federal Constitution contains not a single provision repugnant to those views. The ground we take is, that, by the policy of the framers of the Federal Constitution, Freedom was regarded, protected, and provided for, as a National, Normal, Permanent Interest—Slavery, as Sectional, Exceptional, and Temporary.

A few years before, when organizing the Confederation and declaring its independence of Great Britain, they rested the vindication of their act upon a solemn affirmation of the doctrine that "all men are created equal, with certain unalienable rights," among which "are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" that to protect these rights Governments are instituted; that when a Government fails in this duty, and habitually tramples upon them, it is the right of the People to amend or substitute it; that the British Government had been guilty, in both respects, and therefore, the Colonies were justified in rejecting it, and forming a Government for themselves. The sole ground of their justification was, the doctrine of the natural equality of rights among men. This being admitted, the vindication of their act was triumphant; if untrue, the Declaration of Independence, the foundation of our distinct existence as a Sovereign People, is simply a lie. Our fathers believed it true, and it was this Principle that controlled their action when they came to found the Constitution of the United States; for in behalf of the People of the United States they solemnly declared that their intention in framing the Constitution was to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to themselves and posterity. Now, it will be found that all the main provisions of this instrument are manifestly designed and calculated to protect personal liberty, to secure fundamental rights, to restrain the ambition of majorities, to preserve the essential rights of the individual States, to check the tendency of power from the many to the few. Its pervading spirit is, respect for the Principle of Natural and Equal Rights among men.

Three provisions, evidently exceptional in their nature, point to the existence of an Element in the Union in conflict with this Principle: these are, the arrangement in regard to the representative ratio, the clause relating to the migration or importation of persons prior to the year 1808, and the stipulation in regard to fugitives from service or labor. We, who have been born and educated in this country, understand that these provisions have been uniformly applied to Slavery; but a foreigner, unacquainted with our social condition and history, could never infer from the provisions themselves, or from any other portion of the Constitution. The language in which they are clothed is ambiguous; the words, "slave" and "Slavery," are never used; the very idea is rejected. Why? Because the framers of the Constitution felt that Slavery was repugnant to the truth of the Declaration of Independence, repugnant to the spirit and intention of the Constitution they were forming, not fit to be named among the institutions of a Democratic Republic. That is not all—the provisions were so framed, that this exceptional institution might cease to exist, without the necessity of preliminary change to them. Besides, every implication is carefully excluded from them, which might favor or tolerate Slavery as right or proper. They proceed on the assumption that it exists, but not that it is good or just. They make certain arrangements in view of its existence, deemed necessary to prevent the General Government, about to be established, from coming into collision with sectional interests identified with it, but afford no encouragement to it, and no inducement to its continued existence.

"Line upon line, precept upon precept," is a solemnity. We are warned with iterating and reiterating, but the perpetual repetition of error and sophistry imposes the wearisome task upon us.

The three provisions alluded to are these: 1. "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be embraced within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be de-

termined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."—Art. 1, sec. 2, Con. U. S.

2. "The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars a head."—Con. U. S., art. 1, sec. 9.

3. "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—Con. U. S., art. 1, sec. 11.

The first provision, as Americans understand it, recognizes the existence of Slavery as a fact, but certainly gives no countenance to it. On the contrary, it makes it a ground and reason for reducing the representative power of the communities upholding it, so that it is in fact a positive discouragement to Slavery.

The second provision, as we have already explained, secured for the General Government power to put an end to the slave trade in 1808, a real gain to Freedom and Humanity, as before the adoption of this it had no power over the subject whatever. The securing this power was a triumph of the Anti-Slavery Principle of our fathers; the postponement of its exercise till 1808, was the result of circumstances, as they thought, beyond their control.

The third clause certainly does not apply in terms to slaves; it does embrace, we all know, the case of free persons, held to service or labor, as apprentices. Were a court, in its administration of a law passed in strict conformity to this provision, to confine itself to its terms, no slave could be delivered up under it, because no slave owes or can owe service. The slave renders service to his master, not because it is "due," in the language of the Constitution, but because he is compelled by force to render it. We know only by history that the provision was intended by those who introduced it to apply to both fugitive slaves and apprentices; but from the same history we learn that it was introduced incidentally, attracted little attention, and was adopted without careful examination of its bearings or probable consequences; that the object of it was to prevent the owners of slaves in the States from sustaining loss by their escape, but that no one dreamed that it sanctioned Slavery, encouraged it, or would perpetuate it.

The *Sentinel* dwells upon this clause of the Constitution with great complacency, assuming that it establishes Slavery throughout the Union, and surrounds it everywhere with the sanction and support of the General Government. Where is its authority for the assumption? If it confine itself to the provision alone, to the only legitimate construction, its terms suggest and the general spirit and aim of the Federal Constitution warrant, then we say that provision is not applicable to slaves at all. If it refer to History, and the Madison Papers containing an account of the proceedings of the Federal Convention that adopted it, for the purpose of showing that it was intended to embrace the case of fugitive slaves, then it must not go beyond History and that record. But, if it appeal to them, then it must admit, that public sentiment in the colonies, when they embarked in the war of Independence, was against Slavery; that after the Declaration of Independence, State after State, by judicial decision or legislative enactment, recognized the policy of emancipation; that in the last Congress of the Confederation, sitting at the same time the Convention that formed our present Constitution was in session, the famous Ordinance of 1787 was passed, excluding Slavery forever from the Territory Northwest of the Ohio river—the only Territory then belonging to the United States; that this act was not the offspring of any purpose to draw a line between slave territory and free, but of the policy then dictated by public sentiment, of limiting Slavery; that in the Convention that formed the present Constitution, Slavery was uniformly treated as an exceptional and transient system, to be tolerated as a necessary evil, for the time, while every provision in relation to it was so framed as to avoid mentioning its name, or recognizing its fundamental principle, so that it might at any time be abolished in the States without the slightest change being required in the Federal Constitution; that the delegates from Virginia and Maryland were the most strenuous against the insertion of any provision that might encourage the perpetration or extension of the evil; that an amendment having been proposed which seemed to involve the recognition of the idea that man could hold man as property, it was modified so as to exclude this idea, at the suggestion of Mr. Madison, who insisted that the Constitution they were forming ought not to contain any implication that man could be property; that the abolition of the slave trade in those days was regarded as involving the abolition of Slavery; that the clause conferring power in Congress to prohibit the slave trade in 1808, was adopted with a view to facilitate and hasten the extinction of Slavery; and that the provision in regard to fugitives from service or labor was not intended even by the South Carolina delegates, who suggested it, to give encouragement or sanction to Slavery, to establish it under the jurisdiction of the General Government, to nationalize it, but merely as a stipulation between the States, securing the slaveholder against pecuniary loss through the occasional escape of his slaves, and that it was agreed to with scarcely any discussion or examination, in a Convention the great majority of the members of which acted, whenever the subject of Slavery was referred to, under the full persuasion that it was a temporary institution, whose arrangements might be made respecting it, would of course be temporary, and not vitiate the essential character of the Constitution they were forming.

The *Sentinel* may then take its choice. If it confine itself to the letter of the clause, there is no Slavery in it; if it go to History and the Record for the interpretation, it must stand upon our ground and come to our conclusion. As confirming our views, we illustrate the intention of those who framed the Federal Constitution, and the opinions of Madison, a recognized authority with Southern statesmen, and

as incidental though forcible testimony to the soundness of the position assumed by the *Sentinel*, we shall close this article by quoting freely from a debate which sprung up on the subject of the slave trade, in the first Congress under the Constitution.

The tariff bill having been reported in the House, in May, 1789, Mr. Parker, of Virginia, moved to insert a clause imposing a duty of ten dollars on every slave imported. He was sorry that Congress had not the power to stop the importation altogether. "It was contrary to revolutionary principles, and ought not to be permitted." Smith, of South Carolina, with characteristic jealousy of Federal interposition, opposed the motion. Sherman, of Connecticut, favored the object of the motion, but did not think it a fit subject to be embraced in the bill. "He could not reconcile himself to the insertion of human beings, as a subject of import, among goods, wares, and merchandise." He hoped the motion would be withdrawn for the present, and taken up afterwards as an independent subject.

Jackson, of Georgia, opposed the motion, charged Virginia with selfishness in her labors to suppress the slave trade, hoped the gentleman would withdraw his motion, and that, should it be brought forward again, "it might comprehend the white slaves (as well as the black) imported from all the jails of Europe." Parker persisted in his motion. "He hoped Congress would do all in their power to restore to human nature its inherent privileges; to wipe off, if possible, the stigma under which America labored; to do away the inconsistency of our principles, justly charged upon us; and to show, by our actions, the pure beneficence of the doctrines held out to the world in our Declaration of Independence."

Ames, of Massachusetts, "detested Slavery from his soul; but he had some doubts whether imposing a duty on their importation would not have an appearance of countenancing the practice."

At this juncture, Mr. Madison, who had taken a leading part in the construction of the Constitution, came to the support of the motion of his colleague in a powerful speech. Read some extracts from it, and say, whether the illustrious Virginia statesman, a fair representative at that time of the "fathers of the Republic," regarded Slavery or Slavery as the *Sentinel* and its associates now do, or, rather, whether his views do not confirm those presented in the *Era*:

"The confounding men with merchandise," he said, "might be easily avoided, by altering the title of the bill: it was in fact the very object of the motion, to prevent men, so far as the power of Congress extended, from being confounded with merchandise. The clause in the Constitution allowing a tax to be imposed, though the traffic could not be prohibited for twenty years, was inserted, he believed, for the very purpose of enabling Congress to give some testimony of the sense of America with respect to the African trade."

"By expressing a national disapprobation of the trade, it is to be hoped we may destroy it, and so save ourselves from reproaches and our posterity from the imbecility ever attendant on a country filled with slaves."

"This was as much the interest of South Carolina and Georgia as any other States. Every addition they received to their number of slaves, tended to weakness, and rendered them less capable of self-defence. In case of hostilities with foreign nations, their slave population would be a means, not of repelling, but of inviting attack. It was the duty of the General Government to protect every part of the Union against dangers, as well internal as external."

"Everything, therefore, that tended to increase this danger, though it might be a local affair, yet if it involved national expense or safety, became of concern to every part of the Union, and a proper subject for the consideration of those charged with the general administration of the Government."

Bland, of Virginia, was no less decided in his support of the motion. Burke suggested that, if not particularly named, slaves would still fall under the general five per cent ad valorem duty on all unenumerated articles.

"Madison replied, that no collector of the customs would presume to apply the terms goods, wares, and merchandise, to persons; and in this he was supported by Sherman, who denied that persons were recognized anywhere in the Constitution as property. He thought that the clause in the Constitution on which the present motion was founded applied as much to other persons as to slaves, and that there were other persons to whom it ought to be applied, as convicts, for instance; but the whole subject ought to be taken up by itself. Finally, upon Madison's suggestion, Parker consented to withdraw his motion, with the understanding that a separate bill should be brought in."

In the face of such authority as this, the Pro-Slavery men in our day talk flippantly of slaves being regarded as "property," as "merchandise," as "chattels," by the Constitution; and the *Sentinel* coolly declares that "our forefathers" "gave their sanction to widen the basis of Slavery by extending the period of the slave trade, and made diligent use of that extension of time to reap a rich harvest," when, as a matter of fact, all the States but Georgia had prohibited the trade in 1789, and all the States, without exception, in 1798.

Enough for this time.

PHOTOGRAPHY IN THE HIGH SCHOOL.—The Philadelphia Sun is glad to see that the Board of Controllers have appointed a committee to inquire into the value of photography as a branch of learning, with a view to reinstating it in the course of the High School; and says it was an ill-advised movement to expunge it, that public opinion is clamorous for its restitution; and that there is no more important time-saving accomplishment to be acquired than the use of photography, and that it is peculiarly valuable in every walk of life. In all these sayings the Sun is in the right.

MEMORIALS AGAINST THE NEBRASKA BILL are pouring in upon Congress. We hope that every State, county, city, and village, will make its voice heard on this subject.

N. Y. Com. Advertiser.

And we hope so too. The people must and will be heard on this measure. But it was far from the purpose of its authors that they should be heard.

### CONGRESS.

The speech this day delivered in the United States Senate by the Hon. Mr. Seward, was listened to with profound attention. There was indeed a "listening Senate." Our usual synopsis is omitted, and we present a portion of the production in extenso.

In the House, the speech of Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, was beautifully declaimed, and commanded breathless attention; but it was not substantially strong. But little matter was indeed presented. He was replied to by Mr. Campbell, of Ohio, who was speaking with signal energy and effect when our report closed.

### SLAVERY ILLUSTRATIONS.

The judgment of Judge Baker, in the case of Mrs. Douglas, recently imprisoned at Norfolk, Virginia, for the abominable offence of teaching slaves and free colored persons to read and write, has been published at length in the papers of that city.

We learn from the same papers that "a detestable tragedy occurred lately in the vicinity of Hampton," a man named Watson having flogged one of his slaves so severely as to cause his death. Suspicion, it is said, was first entertained from the sudden death and secret interment of the negro; and the body being disinterred and subjected to the inspection of a jury, a verdict to the above effect was given. A warrant was issued for the arrest of Watson, who immediately fled, and has not since been heard of.

If slaves and other people of color could read and write, and were sufficiently intelligent and moral to be competent witnesses in such cases as the above, their masters would have fewer opportunities to murder in secret and with impunity. But Mrs. Douglas was in prison, and the murderer, Watson, has escaped.

The *Southside Democrat*, published at Petersburg, Va., has the following piece of irony:

"Slavery.—The appalling curses of Slavery are held up in their own odious colors in the last census. Just look here: Massachusetts and Tennessee have nearly the same population—Tennessee being by some thousands the most populous—yet, on account of the blighting curse of Slavery, Tennessee has 591 paupers in her confines; while the free State of Massachusetts has only—5,540, or nearly ten times as many."

"Again, Kentucky has three times the population of Connecticut; yet Kentucky, with the blighting curse of Slavery, has 777 paupers; while Connecticut has 1,774. Kentucky, with three times the population, has not half the paupers."

It is admitted that, in the free States, the paupers, who are chiefly immigrants, are fed and clothed at the public expense; while in the slave States there are but few immigrants, and the superannuated slaves are of course fed by their owners, if fed at all.

A like explanation may be made in regard to criminal statistics. In the free States, all convicted criminals are punished under the laws; while in the slave States, "chivalry" often excuses homicide by the master, and almost every crime among the slaves is passed over by the laws, and punished—if punished at all—by the master. Theft is a whipping offence; infanticide is punished by protracted severity; and for manslaughter, or the attempt to commit it, the slave is not unfrequently sold "further South."

It would be well for our Southside friends if they would not institute comparisons of this kind.

Here are a couple of cases in point. They are credited in the *New York Tribune* to the *Baltimore Argus*:

"A slave, belonging to L. A. Thomas, was indicted and tried for murdering a slave belonging to the Rev. Mr. Lancaster, last week, at Frankfort, Kentucky, found guilty, and sentenced to receive sixty-five lashes."

"William Gibbons, colored, tried on two indictments charging him with stealing a gelding, saddle, and bridle, the property of Michael B. Cline, was found guilty of stealing the gelding, but declared innocent of the remaining indictment. The prisoner was then sentenced to be sold out of the State for the term of eight years."

A slave gets sixty-five lashes for murdering a fellow slave, and a free negro is sold out of the State for eight years, for stealing a horse!

GRINNELL LAND.—The official swindle attempted in England by the Admiralty appears to be too gross for the popular approval, and we find that the *London Athenaeum*, in reviewing Dr. Kane's narrative of the United States Grinnell expedition, which has been published in London, acknowledges that this expedition was the first to discover "Grinnell Land," which the British authorities have called Prince Albert Land, claiming that it was first discovered by the British explorers.

This case was so clearly made out by a paper from the pen of Col. Peter Force, of Washington, published a year ago, that there could not possibly be two opinions on the subject among those who read that production.

SIR E. L. BULWER.—The Cambridge (Eng.) Philo-Union Society is said to have requested Sir E. B. Lytton to preside at its twenty-eighth anniversary, and to have received from the literary Baronet the following very remarkable answer:

"Sir: I am not so fond of speaking and lecturing as you must have pre-supposed, and would rather go sixty miles to avoid than sixty miles to incur the indignity you so kindly suggest to me. It is only in very rare and special instances—where I might really be of service—that I attend other public meetings than those of Parliament; and, certainly, Cambridge is the last place in the world at which philosophy and letters can be supposed to require aid or commendation. I have, &c., &c., E. BULWER LYTTON."

"1 Park Lane, Dec. 28, 1853."

When Bulwer made his first attempt in Parliament, he had good reason to grieve that he had not embraced many previous opportunities of lecturing, for he made a dead failure that time.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The opponents of the Nebraska bill held a meeting in the City Hall at Manchester, on Monday evening, and at an early hour the hall was crowded. The Hon. William Plummer, of Epping, addressed the meeting. David Cross, Geo. W. Flinders, and Daniel Clark, Esqs., each made powerful appeals to the people to wise and rebuke the projectors of this gigantic fraud upon justice and humanity. There was to be another meeting at Concord, and another at Nashua.

"TO WHAT BARE USES," &c.—We have seen many beautiful and popular actresses survive the day of their glory, and pass away unheeded. We recently read an account of the miserable death of one whom many now living in this city remember as the public idol in her youthful days; and we can remember another, every tone of whose voice was music to every ear, and yet who died but a few years since, from the madness of drunkenness.

Mad'le Georges, says a paper before us, the great French actress—whose life, after having been a series of brilliant adventures, has been gradually declining—has been reduced to petitioning for the office of umbrella-taker at one of the doors of the Great Exhibition in Paris, in 1855.

The area of all the States of Europe is given at 3,684,832 square miles.

Captain Edward Bruce Hamley, of the British army, is the author of "Lady Lee's Widowhood."

CONNECTICUT.—In the Whig State Convention, which assembled on the 15th, Hon. Jas. Dixon was chosen President. The candidates for State officers were nominated by ballot, as follows:

Governor—Henry Dutton, of New Haven. Lieut. Governor—A. H. Holley, of Salisbury. Sec'y of State—O. H. Perry, of Fairfield. Treasurer—D. W. Camp, of Middletown. Comptroller—John Dunham, of Norwich.

The resolutions adopted are in favor of a protective tariff and internal improvements, and against the repeal of the Missouri Compromise.

"OY NO CONSEQUENCE!"—The Richmond Enquirer says:

"The opinions of Mr. Jore. Clemens are of the least possible consequence."

That is what Mr. Toole said, when Mr. Dombey's dog tore his pants, though Mr. Toole was at that moment in a decided state of perturbation.

DOINGS IN THE SENATE.—A dispatch in the *Baltimore American* this morning says:

"The Senate to-day, in Executive session, had some conversation relative to the manner in which the Gadsden treaty got before the public. I have not heard, however, whether they proposed any action on the subject."

"The President to-day sent to the Senate a copy of the Conkling treaty, for information, in answer to a call of that body in secret session."

"It is understood that the friends of the Nebraska bill in the House intend to tack the Homestead bill to it, so as to compel the Northern members to vote for it."

A MANLY PORTION.—The following is from the address of one of the Representatives in Congress from Indiana, to his constituents:

"WASHINGTON, Feb. 2, 1854.

"A question is now pending in Congress to repeal the Missouri Compromise act of 1820, which restricts Slavery in what is called the Louisiana Territory, acquired from France by treaty of 1803, north of latitude 36 deg. 30 min. No more has been made, in or out of Congress, to repeal this act since its passage, thirty-four years ago, until the present session of Congress. If repealed, it will permit Slavery to exist in a country now free, equal in extent to ten States as large as Indiana, the greater part of it being susceptible, as I am told, of high cultivation and improvement."

The movement, in my opinion, is a violation of plighted faith, and an enormous outrage upon the rights of the people of the non-slaveholding States. If Slavery is introduced into this Territory, it excludes my constituents from it, at least those of limited means; for no poor man desires to live in a slave State, and socially and politically occupy no higher position than a slave. I have many conclusive reasons why I will oppose, with my vote and all the influence I have, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise act, all of which will be made known as soon as opportunity offers in the House."

"This momentous question did not enter into the contest for Congress when you elected me. It is new both to you and me. I have felt it due to you and myself to indicate my fixed purposes. If they accord with your wishes, nothing will give me more pleasure; if not, advise me, and I will resign, and thereby enable you to elect one who will vote for a repeal of the Compromise referred to. I will never do it."

DANIEL MACKER.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS, who has just returned to his home at Rochester, and to his editorial duties, speaking of the excitement of his lecturing campaign, remarks that "it is not easy to combine in one person mastery in the two vocations. The pen is a bore to the speaker, and the writer generally would be excused from speech-making. He who has to work in both departments must not be held to a very strict account, either as to matter or manner of his work." The experience of many will confirm the truth of these sayings.

WARLIKE.—The last number of the *Edinburgh Review* says:

"Every Minister of the Crown who advises, and every member of Parliament who votes for, a war with Russia, must, if he understands the true interest of England, be prepared to make the utmost exertions, to strike the hardest blow, and to inflict the deepest wounds, which the vast resources of this country will permit."

A DEMOCRATIC PAPER IN NEBRASKA.—We acknowledge the receipt of the first two numbers of a Democratic paper published in the Territory of Nebraska. There is a useful and effective moral in this little journal. It is an earnest argument on the necessity of organizing our new Territories—Union of yesterday.

Speaking of the publication of this same paper, a late number of the *St. Louis Republican* says:

"We have learned, on the best authority, that the paper is a 'find' upon the public. The paper is printed at Sidney, in Iowa, fifteen or twenty miles from Old Fort Kearney; but it is dated from that place, in order still further to impose upon public credulity."

In Cincinnati and Hamilton county, Ohio, is a population of 200,000 souls, with an immense manufacturing interest requiring a large circulation. They have but one bank of issue, with a capital of \$100,000, and no prospect of an increase.

MARTIN KOSTKA.—Mr. Kedzie, an attorney of Chicago, Illinois, has written to Kostka, offering to support him until he can acquire a sufficient knowledge of the American law to practice in the courts. This generous person also sent him \$50 to defray his expenses to Chicago. Kostka has accepted the offer, and left New York on Monday, for this Western city of refuge. The President of the Erie railroad gave him a free passage to Chicago.

From the New York Evening Post.

### THE VOICE OF THE WEST.

We quoted, the other day, the protest of the Missouri Democrat against the wickedness of the Nebraska scheme. That print is not alone, among the journals of the State, in its opposition to Mr. Douglas's bill. Another St. Louis paper, the *Intelligencer*, in discussing it, says:

"We hold that, in regard to the territory embraced by the Missouri Compromise, and the territories embraced in the Compromise of 1850, the question between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding sections is already settled by valid enactments, and we are simply for abiding by that settlement. It is those who propose to repeal one of the existing enactments, that are renewing the Slavery agitation in the nation at large, and are for discountenancing that renewal, in conformity with the pledges of the Representatives of our party in solemn convention at Baltimore. The bills for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska ought to say nothing about Slavery, except that all questions relating to personal freedom are left to the courts of the Territory, with appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States."

The nonsense which we have so often heard, about the unconstitutionality of Congress interfering in the legislation of the Territories, is thus disposed of by the same journal:

"Suppose a body of free negroes should emigrate to Nebraska, and get possession of it, as the Mormons have of Utah, would Congress be bound to admit them as a sovereign State of the Union on their application? It is not probable that such a thing will ever occur, but it illustrates the absurdity of the pretended right of the population of a Territory to dispose of it at their own discretion. Even the white inhabitants of a Territory may be so unfit for free and civilized institutions, for want of political and moral training, that Congress may and ought, in justice to the existing confederated States which they represent, to keep those Territories out of the family, until their people do acquire the necessary education, or the Anglo-Americans gain the ascendancy."

We have before us the *Detroit Daily Democrat*, which publishes extracts from Mr. Wade's recent spirited speech against the Nebraska fraud, commending them to the attention of its readers. From the same paper we learn that the people of Michigan are beginning to move in getting up remonstrances against the repeal of the prohibition of Slavery in the act of 1820. At Detroit, a meeting of citizens without distinction of party has been held, to take measures for circulating petitions against the bill for signatures.

The Chicago Democratic Press, the organ of Douglas's own friends in Illinois, alluding to a second meeting of the people of Chicago, called for Saturday evening, at the South Market Hall, to protest against Douglas's bill, says, emphatically:

"We are glad this meeting is to be held, and we hope the great national question involved in that issue will be fairly met. Mere pettifoggery about the right of the people to govern themselves will not satisfy sober-minded men; the Missouri Compromise should be repealed. The territory north of 36 deg. and 30 min. was, in 1820, solemnly devoted to Freedom, and for that the South received a *quid pro quo*, viz: the admission of Missouri into the Union as a slave State. There is not the shadow of a legal excuse in reality for the repeal of that Compromise. The South have still their part of the consideration named in 'the bond,' and yet, with a boldness never before equalled in the annals of American legislation, they ask us to yield everything to the insatiable maw of Slavery."

Of those who took part in the first meeting held at Chicago to protest against Mr. Douglas's course, the *Gales and Jeffersonton*, a daily Democratic paper, says:

"The officers of the meeting were 'old line Democrats' of 1848, to whom no taint or suspicion of Free-Soilism or Abolitionism can be attached; the speakers, with one exception, were warm Compromise men in 1850; and the great mass of the hearers were men of peace, willing to acquiesce in what has been done, but not to give another inch to the encroachment of Slavery. The resolutions of the meeting passed by acclamation."

In a subsequent number of the same paper, it speaks thus of the Senator of its own State, who kindled this new quarrel:

"The question has not been raised by the fanatical friends of emancipation, nor by the Free Soil seceders of 1848; nor yet by Northern Democrats, with whom Freedom is not an impulse, but a principle. The latter certainly were to abide the settlement of 1850; they had no firebrand to throw into the Democratic camp—they bore no incendiary torch by which to light sectional strife. The bitter blow comes from another source—from one who has ever declaimed against agitation, and who has grown into political importance from the supposed sincerity of his utterances—from an Illinois Senator! Thank Heaven, he has a free constituency! and when, with a charlatan's air, as this is in substance, he charges them with Abolitionism, or, in his own cant language, 'niggerism,' he will find that they are able and willing to repel the shaft. Upon him rests a burden not easily shaken off."

Public opinion seems to be quite unanimous on this question in all the most populous portion of Illinois. Of Ohio, an Ohio print now lying before us, the *Sandusky Daily Mirror*, says:

"The opinions of the press in relation to the Douglas-Nebraska—the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and extension of Slavery—are so far as the Ohio press is concerned, there are but four dissentients. Two decidedly in its favor, and two more flickering timidly, and cowardly. Some others are still silent on the subject. But the great weight of the press of Ohio is down upon the tearing up of old and settled Custom of the Constitution."

"We shall copy this morning no further testimonies against the meditated outrage. In some hundred newspapers which we have just looked over, the expression of an indignant disapproval of the Nebraska bill is almost unanimous. It is a perfect chorus of condemnation and remonstrance."

From the New York Evening Post.

### THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

What lamentable shipwreck those Democrats of the North—who they be in office, or out, whether in Washington or elsewhere—who favor the Nebraska fraud, are making of the ascendancy and unity of their own party, appears in the result of the late election of a United States Senator for Maine. The Democrats had the power in the Legislature of Maine, and ought to have given us a Democratic member of the United States Senate. To fill the existing vacancy, we ought to have had from that State, a Senator of liberal opinions in regard to commerce, a friend of frugality, a foe of jobs, a strict expounder of the concessions of power to the Federal Government contained in the Constitution. We fear that we have in Mr. Fessenden, who is just elected as the colleague of Mr. Hamlin, one who is the reverse of this. He is a Whig, and his maxims of political conduct have, of course, the vices of the Whig creed.

But he is an enemy of the Nebraska fraud, an open and decided one. His competitor, Mr. Morrill, was not so clear in his opinions, and therefore he was dropped. The majority of both Houses would elect no man to the United States Senate who was not a zealous adversary of the Nebraska fraud, considering that the great question of the day. They allowed it to

obliterate for the moment all ordinary party differences, and